

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,011	09/15/2003	Reza Stegamat	E3311.0002	1732
32172 DICKSTEIN S	7590 05/02/2007 SHAPIRO LLP	EXAMINER		
1177 AVENUI	E OF THE AMERICAS (6	WILLIAMS, JOSEPH L		
NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2879	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application	Application No. Applicant(s)				
		10/663,01	I	STEGAMAT, REZA			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Joseph L. V	Villiams	2879			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTE WHICHEVI - Extensions o after SIX (6) - If NO period - Failure to rep Any reply rec	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY ER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA f time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period wolly within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, relived by the Office later than three months after the mailing at term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THE 36(a). In no ever will apply and will a cause the applic	S COMMUNICATION nt, however, may a reply be time expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cation to become ABANDONED	ely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status				• ,			
2a)⊠ This 3)□ Since	ection is FINAL . 2b) This ethis application is in condition for allowanted in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i> .	action is no	on-final. or formal matters, pro				
Disposition of	Claims						
4a) 0 5)	pecification is objected to by the Examine	wn from con	sideration. quirement.				
 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 							
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notice of Dr 3) Information	eferences Cited (PTO-892) aftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) /Mail Date		4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te			

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment and response filed on 01 February 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 13-16 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (US 7,098,069 B2).

Regarding claim 13, Yamazaki ('069) teaches in figure la and 1c and the corresponding column and line numbers, an apparatus comprising a substrate (no number, but see plate where TFT's 1-3 are located) at least one active element (TFT 1-3), the active element fabricated on the substrate; and an encapsulation cap (33) attached to the substrate (via the components in between) protecting and covering the element from environmental exposure, and wherein the encapsulation cap traps gas between the element and the encapsulation cap, wherein the gas mixture includes at least hydrogen (see column 32, lines 13-43).

Further regarding claim 13 the Examiner notes that the claim limitation that the element has been exposed to an exposure environment containing moisture in the form

of water vapor for a specified period of time prior to the encapsulation cap being bonded is drawn to a process of manufacturing, which is incidental to the claimed apparatus. It is well established that a claimed apparatus cannot be distinguished over the prior art by a process limitation. Consequently, absent a showing of an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art, the subject product by process claim limitation is not afforded patentable weight (see MPEP 2113).

Regarding claim 14, Yamazaki ('069) teaches the gas mixture contains nitrogen.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, the claimed limitations are drawn to a process of manufacturing, which is incidental to the claimed apparatus. It is well established that a claimed apparatus cannot be distinguished over the prior art by a process limitation.

Consequently, absent a showing of an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art, the subject product by process claim limitation is not afforded patentable weight (see MPEP 2113).

Regarding claim 18, Yamazaki ('069) teaches the active element comprises at least one emissive layer, the element causing said emissive layer to emit light using an applied electric potential (see figures 3a and 3b).

Regarding claim 19, Yamazaki ('069) teaches an anode layer, the anode layer transporting holes to the emissive layer; a cathode layer, the cathode layer transporting

Application/Control Number: 10/663,011

Art Unit: 2879

electrons to the emissive layer, the transported holes and electrons recombining in said emissive layer to cause said emissive layer to emit light (see figures 3A and 3B).

Regarding claim 20, Yamazaki ('069) teaches emissive layer is composed of an at least partially organic material (see abstract).

Regarding claims 21 and 22, the claimed limitations are drawn to a process of manufacturing, which is incidental to the claimed apparatus. It is well established that a claimed apparatus cannot be distinguished over the prior art by a process limitation.

Consequently, absent a showing of an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art, the subject product by process claim limitation is not afforded patentable weight (see MPEP 2113).

Conclusion

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2879

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph L. Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-2465. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30 AM-3:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joseph L. Williams Primary Examiner Art Unit 2879